

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 5, 13, 14, 20, 25-33 and 34 are allowed. By this response, claims 1, 15 and 21 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

#### **Prior Art Rejection**

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 15-17, 21-23 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Mok (US 6,008,986), Twyford (US 6,386,413) and Lee (WO 01/15940); claims 4, 6, 18, 24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Mok, Twyford, Lee and Batio (US 5,949,643); claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Mok, Twyford, Lee, Batio and Suga (US 4,800,376); and claims 10-12 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Mok, Twyford, Lee and Ames (US 4,787,040). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 15 and 21 have been amended to further define the relationship of the instrument panel, operating unit and display unit. It is noted that each of these claims refer to the display being positioned within an instrument panel such that when the operating unit is in a first position the operating unit is substantially flush with the instrument panel and covers part of the display. These elements in the combination recited must be taught by the provided references. Applicants respectfully submit that the references fail to teach these features .

First, the claims refer to the display being within the instrument panel and not adjacent to or attached on the instrument panel. In the Office Action the Examiner states that Lee “discloses a keyboard and a display mounted to the instrument panel of the vehicle.” See page 4 of the Office Action. Being

mounted to an instrument panel is not the same as being mounted within an instrument panel. Lee does not teach the claimed features as alleged.

Second, the references must teach that an operating unit partially covers the display which is mounted within the instrument panel when in a first position such that the operating unit is substantially flush to the instrument panel. Applicant respectfully submit that neither of the references taken alone or in combination teach these features.

Although the Lee reference teaches a keyboard which is mounted so that it closes to be substantially flush with the instrument panel, nowhere does either of the references alone or in combination suggest that a display is mounted within the instrument panel and that the operating unit then partially covers the display when it is substantially flush with the instrument panel. At best the references teach a stand alone display or laptop located outside the instrument panel in which the operating unit is either detachable or provided within the instrument panel itself. There is no teaching or suggestion otherwise to modify these teachings in the manner claimed by Applicants.

Further, regarding claim 15 neither references teach or suggest scaling the image on the display when the operating unit partially covers the display. In fact, there is no teaching or suggestion of partially covering a display at all within any of the cited references let alone a teaching or suggestion of scaling the image due to the partial covering.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 15 and 21 are distinguishable over the cited references. Further, dependent claims are also distinguishable in view of the cited references for the above reasons as well as for the additional features they

recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

### Conclusion


For at least the above reasons Applicants respectfully submit claims 1-34 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Chad J. Billings  
Registration No.: 48,917  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant